

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-16 are pending. No new matter has been presented.

Claims 1 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knight, U.S. Patent No. 5,825,436, in view of Eichenlaub, U.S. Patent No. 6,157,424. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites "a resin layer having the property of transmitting light is formed in the light transmitting part." The Examiner asserts that Knight's layer 82 corresponds to the claimed resin layer. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Knight describes layer 82 as a transparent region. However, Knight's layers 82 are actually liquid crystal layers, not resin layers. As shown in Figs. 1 and 3-5, and col. 3, lines 14-45 of Knight, liquid crystal fluid 76 is provided over the entire display region including the vertical segments 80 and the transparent regions 82. Knight, at col. 3, lines 26-29, describes that the liquid crystal fluid 76 is sandwiched between the two planar pieces of material 72, 74 to provide an encapsulated structure. Thus, it is clear that the liquid crystal fluid 76 forms a single layer structure over the entire display region including the vertical segments 80 and the transparent regions 82. In other words, Knight's liquid crystal layer is not separated by resin or other materials.

Further, as described in col. 3, lines 39-46 of Knight, when a voltage is applied to a pair of electrodes connected across the two planar pieces of material 72, 74 in the vicinity of the particular vertical segment 80, a portion of the liquid crystal layer associated with this vertical segment 80 is driven, thereby causing the vertical segment 80 to be transparent or opaque. On the other hand, in the transparent regions 82, the liquid crystal layer remains transparent. Thus, it

is clear that the transparent regions 82 are made of a liquid crystal layer, not a resin layer. Thus, Knight fails to teach that which the Examiner asserts.

Further, applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had no reason to modify Knight to provide for creating 3D images, as asserted by the Examiner. Knight is directed to controlling the viewing angle of a display screen to provide privacy (see col. 1, lines 7-12). One of ordinary skill in the art would not seek to modify Knight to make the display capable of displaying 3D images, contrary to the Examiner's assertions. Knight seeks to limit the viewability of certain portions of its screen and adding the claimed polarizers would not further that goal. Thus, applicants submit that one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of the cited references to create the claimed invention. The Examiner is merely choosing various elements of the cited references in an effort to recreate the claimed invention in hindsight. This is improper. For at least these reasons, applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 7 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakata, U.S. Patent No. 4,729,640, in view of Eichenlaub. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner admits that Sakata fails to teach or suggest a pair of polarizers sandwiching the pair of transparent-electrode substrates therebetween, wherein the directions of transmission easy axes of the pair of polarizers are approximately parallel to each other. However, the Examiner asserts that Eichenlaub teaches this feature and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Sakata to provide the polarizers taught by Eichenlaub "because such modification would provide a thinner, simpler, and less expensive device in which 2D image [sic] can be viewed without applying voltage to the barrier device and

3D image [sic] can be viewed by applying voltage to the barrier device” (citing col. 7, lines 10-25). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Sakata is totally unconcerned with generating 3D images. Thus, one skilled in the art would not seek to modify Sakata to include Eichenlaub’s polarizers so that 3D images can be displayed easily. The Examiner’s reasons for modifying Sakata in view of Eichenlaub are clearly another effort to recreate the claimed invention in hindsight.

Claims 3 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knight in view of Eichenlaub; further in view of Sakata. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knight in view of Eichenlaub (or Sakata in view of Eichenlaub); further in view of Baek, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0004687. Claims 12-16 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knight in view of Eichenlaub; further in view of Akins, U.S. Patent No. 6,842,170. Claims 12-16 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakata in view of Eichenlaub; further in view of Lipton, U.S. Patent No. 5,686,975. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

These claims are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies and further in view of the failure of these additional references to overcome the deficiencies of Knight and Sakata. Further, as stated above, there would have been no reason to modify either Knight or Sakata in view of these other references. Thus, applicants request that these rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the entire application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that further issues require resolution prior to allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney of record at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Deborah S. Gladstein/
Deborah S. Gladstein
Reg. No. 43,636

DSG:nd
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100